

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE

CLAIMS NO: HC11C01999

CHANCERY DIVISION

BETWEEN:

CIARA PARKES

Claimant

and

(1) NEWS GROUP NEWSPAPERS LIMITED  
(2) GLENN MICHAEL MULCAIRE

Defendants

---

STATEMENT IN OPEN COURT

---

Solicitor Advocate for the Claimant

1. In this action, for misuse of private information, breach of confidence and harassment, I appear for the Claimant. My learned friend, Michael Silverleaf QC, appears for the First Defendant.
2. The Claimant is the chairman of Public Eye Communications Limited and has been for the past 18 years. In 2005-2006, her company represented, amongst others, the actors Jude Law and Sienna Miller, who are also close friends of the Claimant.  

---
3. The First Defendant was the publisher of the News of the World newspaper which had a considerable readership in this jurisdiction and which also published its content on its website [www.newsoftheworld.com](http://www.newsoftheworld.com). The Second Defendant was a private investigator engaged by the First Defendant to carry out various investigative activities. His methods included blagging information from mobile phone companies and the unlawful interception of voicemail messages.

4. In 2003-2005, the First Defendant published a series of articles in the News of the World about Ms Miller and Mr Law, which contained intrusive and private information.
5. The Claimant, Ms Miller and Mr Law did not know the source of this information and could not understand how this private information was ending up in the public domain. Although the articles would often only contain a small piece of accurate information, it was enough for Ms Miller and Mr Law to suspect everyone close to them, including the Claimant.
6. Over the same period, the Claimant, Ms Miller and Mr Law all experienced unusual activity on their mobile phones including hang up calls and missing voicemail messages. As a consequence, the Claimant, Ms Miller and Mr Law became increasingly concerned about their mobile phone security. The Claimant arranged for Ms Miller and Mr Law to change their mobile telephone numbers and put them through her company. The Claimant also arranged to have a secret mobile phone that only Ms Miller, Mr Law and she knew about.
7. Despite all these precautions, articles carried on appearing, in the News of the World and other papers, which contained extremely private information. In addition to this, journalists and photographers always appeared to know where Ms Miller and Mr Law were meeting, even if the location had only been decided at the last moment. This caused further distrust and suspicion between the Claimant, Ms Miller and Mr Law as well as others close to them.
8. In June 2010, the Claimant discovered that both of her mobile numbers and her direct dial numbers, including those for her secret mobile telephone, appeared in the evidence that Ms Miller had obtained from the Metropolitan Police pursuant to

the Order of Mr Justice Sweeney dated 1 June 2010. In addition, the Claimant later discovered from Vodafone call data that she had received several calls to her mobile phone in June and August 2006 from a journalist and/or journalists working for the First Defendant.

9. On 13 June 2011, the Claimant issued proceedings against the First and Second Defendants for misuse of private information, breach of confidence and harassment. Both Defendants indicated their intention to defend the claim and duly served defences. The First Defendant's defence contained a number of limited admissions.

10. On 13 December 2011, the First Defendant made a series of more extensive admissions in relation to the general practice of intercepting voicemail messages by the News of the World. It has become clear and the First Defendant now accepts that the Defendants targeted the Claimant and the Claimant's voicemail messages, and those of her clients and friends, in 2005-2006.

11. I am here today to announce that the First Defendant has accepted liability for voicemail interception and has agreed to pay damages to the Claimant in the sum of £35,000 plus her legal costs. Furthermore, both Defendants have also undertaken not to further access the Claimant's voicemail messages or to publish the Claimant's unlawfully obtained private information or to put her under surveillance.

Counsel for the First Defendant

12. My Lord, on behalf of the first Defendant, I confirm everything my Friend, Mr Thomson, has said.

13. The First Defendant is here today through me to offer its sincere apologies to the Claimant for the damage, as well as the distress, caused to her by the blagging of her confidential information from sources and the accessing of her voicemail messages. The First Defendant acknowledges that the information should never have been

obtained or used in the manner it was and that the First Defendant is liable for misuse of private information and breach of confidence.

Solicitor Advocate for the Claimant

14 In the light of the order which has been made and this statement, the Claimant considers that she is fully vindicated.

  
.....

Mark Thompson

  
.....

Michael Silverleaf O'Connell